REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. New claim 16 has been added, support for which can be found in Figure 3 and paragraph 32 of the corresponding US published application no. 2005/0027658.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatenatable over U.S. Patent No. 5,787,402 to Potter et al. (hereinafter "*Potter*").

The Examiner contends that *Potter* describes the features of manual execution of orders, (col. 2, lines 17-34 of *Potter*) and that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to have combined these features of *Potter* with automated features of *Potter*.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In the present application as claimed, the user has the option of "manually entering pricing data" prior to initiating any type of transaction of the trade data. On the other hand, while *Potter* does describe a system that accepts a user input for entering trade data, as well as transmission of the trade data to a pricing system, *Potter* does not teach or describe the additional feature of also "providing a user input for optionally manually entering pricing data," as recited by amended claim 1 of the present application. Even though in col. 5, lines 15 -21, *Potter* describes providing for varying degrees of manual leave orders, these are manual execution of the trades by the client after receiving the

pricing data. For example, in column 3, lines 3-6, *Potter* defines a leave order as one in which "a customer specifies the terms of the transaction the user desires (called, for example, 'target rate') and then 'leaves' the order with the financial institution." Also, in column 12, lines 52-55, *Potter* describes that "a client ... may cancel a leave order, manually at any time before the FX Order Server sends an order to the FX Trader Server for execution." Therefore, *Potter* merely describes the manual execution of an order that already contains pricing data, NOT a user input for optionally manually adding pricing data before the order is made, as claimed in the present application.

Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Potter* for providing of a manual input of any type of pricing data related to the trade data. In fact, *Potter* teaches away from the manual entering of the pricing data at, for example, col. 2, lines 17-58 of *Potter* by discussing the shortcomings of the manual process. Thus, at least because *Potter* does not teach or suggest "providing a user input for optionally manually entering pricing data," as recited in independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the independent claim 1 is patentable over *Potter*.

Independent amended claim 7 comprises similar features as claim 1 and is therefore patentable over *Potter* for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Each of claims 4-7 and 12-15 ultimately depend from one of claims 1 or 7 and are therefore over *Potter* for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 are in condition for allowance and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

B. In the Office Action, claims 2, 3 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Potter* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156719 to Finebaum et al (hereinafter "*Finebaum*").

Applicants submit that to support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. (MPEP 706.02(j)). *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). *Finebaum* describes a bond trading system and does not cure the deficiencies of *Potter*. Moreover, each of claims 2, 3 and 8-11 depends either directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 7 and is therefore patentable over *Potter* for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3 and 8-11 are in condition for allowance and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

New Claim 16:

Applicants submit that new independent claim 16 is patentable over *Potter* and *Finnebaum* at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 23, 2008

By: Rohini K. Garg
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 45,272

Mail all correspondence to:

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068
T: 973-597-6174
F: 973-597-6175